

Serial No.: 10/741,306  
Group Art Unit: 2619  
Examiner: Jeffrey M. Rutkowski

### REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 13-19 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 13 being independent claims. Claims 6-12 were previously canceled. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 13 are currently amended. In the most recent September 11, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 13-19 (the only remaining claims) under both 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 103.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

The 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection alleges that the specification is not enabling and fails to point out and distinctly claim subject matter with respect to the meaning of the feature of "redirecting the media to the first device." See Office Action, p. 2. However, it is obvious to one skilled in the art reading the specification what this means. The specification makes it clear that "[t]he server further receives media directed to the logical device and redirects the media to the first device." See application, p. 3. In other words, the server simply sends the media to the first device as is well known in the art. Examiner also contends that Applicant fails to distinctly claim what is meant by a "logical device." See Office Action, p. 3. However, as disclosed below in conjunction with the current amendment, a logical device in this application is a logical IP set. See Application, p. 10 and FIG. 1.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

In the First Office Action, independent Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Gallant (US 2002/0131575). Applicants amended Claim 1 to include the "server maintaining for *each of said* at least one of the first devices a *separate* logical device adhering to the first protocol" (emphasis added) limitation, support for which could be found at least in reference to Figure 1, elements 24 and page 10, the last paragraph of the present invention. In contrast, the Examiner set forth that Gallant disclosed a single "logical device" (Fig. 4, Box 16) affiliated with PBX 14.

In the Final Office Action, Examiner maintained the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a), stating that Claim 1 was unpatentable over Gallant in view of Sternagle (US

Serial No.: 10/741,306  
Group Art Unit: 2619  
Examiner: Jeffrey M. Rutkowski

2002/0184376). Examiner argues that Gallant discloses all of the limitations of Claim 1 except maintaining separate logical devices. *See* Final Office Action, p. 3. Examiner alleges that Sternagle teaches a single device with multiple SIP devices within it. However, this is not the equivalent of "the server maintaining for each of said at least one of the first devices a separate logical device adhering to the first protocol" limitation of Claim 1.

Page 10 of the present application in relevant part states:

In order to reconcile the differences in the master-slave and peer-to-peer modes of handling media flows and properly interface the IP-PBX 10 to the SIP network, the SIP-PBX proxy server 18 maintains a logical IP set 24 for each SIP set 16 on the SIP network that maintains IP based signaling and media connectivity with the IP-PBX 10.

FIG. 1 also shows in detail that there is a separate IP set in the proxy server for each SIP

set.

Paragraph 29 of Sternagle in relevant part states:

SIP signaling router 200 includes a plurality of cluster nodes 202 that perform SIP protocol functions. For example, cluster nodes 202 may comprise SIP proxy servers, SIP redirect servers, or combination proxy/redirect server. An active location server 204 maintains a database of SIP location information and replicates the database to SIP cluster nodes 202 and to a standby location server 206. Standby location server 206 provides a redundant copy of the SIP location database maintained by active location server 204 in the event of failure of active location server 204. Management node 208 performs network management functions and other services, such as domain name system (DNS) service, dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) service, and trivial file transfer protocol (TFTP) service.

While it is true that Sternagle discloses a single device with multiple SIP devices within it as disclosed above, this is not the equivalent of "the server maintaining for each of said at least one of the first devices a separate logical device adhering to the first protocol." FIG. 1 of the present application, the relevant discussion pertaining to that figure discussed herein and previously amended Claim 1 reveal that there is a separate IP set in the proxy server for each SIP set not a single device with multiple SIP devices or a SIP signaling router that includes a plurality of cluster nodes that perform SIP protocol functions as discussed in Sternagle. No

Serial No.: 10/741,306  
Group Art Unit: 2619  
Examiner: Jeffrey M. Rutkowski

disclosure in any of the cited references shows a server maintaining for *each* of said at least one of the first devices a *separate* logical device adhering to the first protocol.

Examiner maintains his rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in the most recent September 11, 2008 Office Action stating "the Applicant is arguing features that are not required by the claims, namely the claims do not require the logical device to be an IP set." See Office Action, p. 7, paragraph 27. Independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include language making it explicit that the logical device be a logical IP set to overcome the present rejection.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 2-5, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

In the September 11, 2008 Office Action, the same citation to Sternagle was provided for rejection of the "maintaining for each of the one or more devices a separate logical device adhering to the first protocol" limitation of Claim 13 as was provided with respect to Claim 1. Amended Claim 13 is patentable over the cited references for the same reasons discussed in conjunction with amended Claim 1.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 14-19, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 13, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 13, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

010/010

DEC 09 2008

Serial No.: 10/741,306  
Group Art Unit: 2619  
Examiner: Jeffrey M. Rutkowski

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment and response places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned at 512-306-8533.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Raymond M. Galasso  
Reg. No. 37,832

Correspondence Address:

Alcatel Lucent  
c/o Galasso & Associates, LP  
P.O. Box 26503  
Austin, Texas 78755-0503  
(512) 306-8533 telephone  
(512) 306-8559 fax